UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/554,637 | 10/27/2005 | Min-Hyo Seo | 1599-0293PUS1 | 9196 |
| | 7590 02/25/201 ART KOLASCH & BI | EXAMINER | | |
| PO BOX 747 | | ROGERS, JAMES WILLIAM | | |
| FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 1618 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/25/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/554,637 | SEO ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | 711 01111 | |

| | JAMES W. ROGERS | 1618 | |
|---|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls. | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of the content | nsideration and/or search (see NOT »); | E below); | |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11) | 16 and 41.33(a)). | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-5 and 7-13. | | l be entered and an e: | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a). |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> The request for reconsideration has been considered but | | • | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618 | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendments to the claims would require a new search and/or consideration because new claim 14 now requires that the branched polylactic acid derivative entraps a drug in the micelle by forming stable micelles in aqueous solution and stabilizing poorly-water soluble drugs within the micelle. This new limitation was not searched or considered by the examiner for independent claim 1 since this new limitation was not previously submitted. Additionally independent claim 7 now requires the polylactic acid derivative to have an avg MW of 1,000-18,000 Da, a limitation that was not searched or considered in conjunction with the independent method claim 7. Additionally claims 8-13 which depend upon claim 7 have changed in scope since they now require polylactic acid derivative to have an avg MW of 1,000-18,000 Da in the base claim. Lastly while claim 1 was amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2 to limit the MW of the polylactic acid derivative this changes the scope of the dependent claims 3-5 which depend upon claim 1 and therefore these claims must also meet the limitation of MW of the polylactic acid derivative. Therefore this amendment could require a new search and consideration for claims 3-5. For instance since the prior art could just read on claims 1,3-5 as anticipatory but by the proposed amendment the scope of the dependent claims has changed and therefore the examiner would have to consider an obviousness type of rejection over the MW of the polylactic acid in view of the reference that was anticlinoria to claims 1 and 3-5.